

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-28 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 10 is amended and new claims 21-28 are added.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's indication that claims 1-9 are allowed.

The Office Action rejects claims 10, 11 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,531,994 to Nagano. The Office Action also rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nagano in view of U.S. Patent 6,469,514 to Awamoto. Still further, the Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nagano in view of the Journal of Applied Physics article by Ikeda et al. Finally, the Office Action rejects claims 13 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nagano in view of U.S. Patent 6,587,084 to Alymov et al. (hereinafter Alymov).

The Patent Office issued an Office Action on October 13, 2004. During a December 13, 2004 telephone conference with Examiner LeFlore, applicant's representative, Mr. Oren, indicated that applicant has previously submitted a verified translation of the Korean Priority document, filed January 19, 2001. Applicant had also previously indicated that Ide has a U.S. filing date of March 21, 2001. Applicant made comments and arguments in the October 4, 2004 response that any rejections based on Ide should be withdrawn, since Ide is not prior art to claim 19 (at least based on the Verified Translation of the Korean Priority document). As such, the Patent Office withdrew the rejection of claim 19 based on Ide and issued the Office Action dated February 18, 2005. The following comments are in response to the February 18 Office Action.

In addressing independent claim 10, the Office Action relies on Nagano's column 13, lines 5-9 and lines 19-28. These features relate to Nagano's Figure 21. Nagano's Figure 21 clearly shows one sub-field having a first half and a later half. See the bottom of Figure 21. The sections relied upon in the Office Action all relate to a single sub-field in which in a writing period (ADP) of the first half of the sub-field, the odd-numbered scanning lines are selected in descending order and after the end of the driving sequence of the first half of the sub-field, the later half of the sub-field is performed in which the even-numbered scanning lines are selected in ascending order. In between the ADP of the first half and the ADP of the second half a sustaining period ST and reset period R occur. See Figure 21. These features do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10.

More specifically, independent claim 10 specifically relates to applying a first scan pulse to each of the scan electrodes in ascending number order during an addressing period of a first sub-field, and applying a second scan pulse to each of the scan electrodes in descending number order during an addressing period of a second sub-field. Nagano does not teach or suggest these features. More specifically, Nagano divides a single sub-field into separate writing periods (ADP), each in a different half of a divided sub-field (i.e., first half and second half). There is no suggestion on how Nagano's features may be modified to reach the features of independent claim 10.

Furthermore, the Office Action expressly states that the odd-numbered scanning lines are selected in descending order and the even-numbered scanning lines are selected in ascending order. Therefore, Nagano clearly does not relate to applying a first scan pulse to each of the

scan electrodes in ascending number order in combination with applying a second scan pulse to each of the scan electrodes in descending number order. Rather, Nagano, as alleged in the Office Action, selects odd-numbered scanning lines in a descending order and even-numbered scanning lines in an ascending order for separate writing periods within a single sub-field. For at least these reasons, Nagano does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. Independent claim 10 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 19 defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. For example, independent claim 19 recites applying a first scan pulse to each of the scan electrodes in ascending number order from 1 to K during an addressing period of a first sub-field, applying the first scan pulse to each of the scan electrodes in descending number order from N to K+1 during the addressing period of the first sub-field, applying a second scan pulse to each of the scan electrodes in descending number order from K to 1 during an addressing period of a second sub-field, and applying the second scan pulse to each of the scan electrodes in ascending number order from K+1 to N during the addressing period of the second sub-field. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Nagano does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 19. Awamoto does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 19 missing from Nagano. Further, it would be improper to combine Nagano and Awamoto in order to reach the features of claim 19 since there is no motivation to change the express teachings of these references. Thus, independent claim 19 defines patentable subject matter.

Claims 11-17 and 24-26 depend from claim 10 and claims 20-23 depend from claim 19 and therefore define patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, each of the

dependent claims recites features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references. For example, each of new dependent claims 21-28 recite features that are not taught or suggested by Nagano's disclosure of a single sub-field having two writing periods (ADP) in which signals are separately applied. As such, each of these new dependent claims 21-28 defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17 and 19-28 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: May 18, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610